

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1 and 2 have been amended and claims 21-25 have been added. Claims 1-25 are pending in the application. No new matter has been introduced by this Amendment. Entry and consideration of this Amendment are respectfully requested.

Statement Of The Substance Of Interview

On August 25, 2003, Examiner Tsidulko held a telephonic interview with the undersigned, in which the content and language of claim 1 were discussed. The Examiner agreed that an amendment to the term "local discontinuities" to "localized melting" as suggested would likely overcome the prior art cited in the Office Action mailed on July 30, 2003.

Response To Claim Objections

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that claims 7-8, 11, 17 and 19 are objected to for being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, Applicants choose not to rewrite the claims at this time because amendments and arguments proposed herein are believed to be sufficient to overcome the rejections to the base claim from which the above claims depend.

Response To §102 Rejection

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-14, 18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Duflos (U.S. Patent No. 6,464,382). Applicant respectively traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Duflos discloses each and every

element as set forth in claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-14, 18 and 20. Accordingly, the Applicants have amended claims 1 and 2, as discussed during the Examiner Interview noted above.

As amended, Duflos does not appear to disclose all the elements recited in the claims for the following reasons. First, the product according to Duflos contains two different components with two different refractive indexes (in fact two polymers which are chemically different). Whereas in the framework of the invention, there is initially only one kind of material, which is locally modified physically. But the initial polymer or glass will not transform itself in a completely different polymer/glass in the chemical point of view. Second, the techniques in Duflos for introducing in the matrix of a first component (i.e., balls) made of a second component does not allow for precise distribution of balls inside the matrix, which is contrary to the invention. Third, the manufacture of the product is different. In Duflos, the balls are introduced during or just after the molding of the product, whereas in the framework of the invention, the electromagnetic treatment can be disconnected from the manufacture/molding process of the product.

For example, in the framework of the invention, one may have a single production line for lenses with an optional post treatment at the end of the line. With a laser one can shut down if standard lenses have to be manufactured, and one can turn-on if modified lenses have to be manufactured. In the case of Duflos, the introduction of the balls is part of the molding process, which may require that the line be dedicated to modified lenses.

Accordingly, claims 1 & 2 are believed to be distinguishable over Duflos at least for the reasons noted above. Likewise, claims 2-20 are also believed to be distinguishable over Duflos because of their dependency from claim 1.

Response To §103 Rejection

Claims 4 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos. Claims 5, 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duflos in view of Guyomard (U.S. Patent No. 6,290,287).

Applicants respectfully submit that Guyomard does not overcome the deficiencies noted above in Duflos to render obvious claim 1. Specifically, Guyomard does not teach or suggest a light-diffusion loci that includes localized melting created using electromagnetic radiation on a transparent material.

Accordingly, claims 4, 9, 5, 13, 15 and 16 are believed to be distinguishable over Duflos in view of Guyomard based upon their dependency on claim 1.

New Claims 21-25

New claims 21-25 correspond to original claims 7, 8, 11, 17 & 19 rewritten in independent form to include all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. The claims are rewritten based on the suggestions by the Examiner in the Office Action. Accordingly, new claims 21-25 should be deemed allowable without further comment.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the above amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and are now in condition for allowance.


AUTHORIZATIONS

Two checks for \$420.00 and \$348.00, respectively, are enclosed for covering the fees for two-month extension and addition of extra claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this filing to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4767. Likewise, any overpayment is credited to Deposit Account No. 13-4503, Order No. 1948-4767.

Respectfully submitted,
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: December 30, 2003

By:


Mark D. Pratt
Reg. No.:45,794
(202) 857-7887 Telephone
(202) 857-7929 Facsimile

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
Morgan & Finnegan
345 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10154